

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/773,556**

Applicant(s)  
**DIAZ et al.**

Examiner  
**James O. Hansen**

Art Unit  
**3637**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James O. Hansen

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Randy Noranbrock

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jun 18 2003 & Jun 19, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: claims on record e.g., claim 11

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Anderson et al., and Crane Jr. et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant requested an interview on the merits after the Final office action [6/18/03]. During the interview the examiner reiterated the position that the cited prior art teaches the present limitations as structurally claimed based upon a reasonable broad interpretation. On June 19, 2003, the examiner extended the courtesy of a second interview after Final, applicant suggested claim amendments i.e., cover panels attached solely to the side panels so as to define over the cited art. The examiner stated that at this point in the prosecution history, such an amendment would raise new issues prompting further consideration and search if entered [upon a quick inspection, it was not viewed that the applied prior art "cover panels" were attached solely to the "side panels"]. Applicant has further options at this point.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**JAMES O. HANSEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3637**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required